

# FEATURES/COLUMNISTS

STAT

BALTIMORE SUN 2 MAY 1982 Pg. 1

## Raid was Britain's first major step to isolate Argentine forces on isles

By Charles W. Corddry  
Washington Bureau of The Sun

Washington—In bombing the Falklands' only significant airfield yesterday, Britain made a major move to isolate Argentine forces on the islands and to reduce potential threats to its fleet.

If the field at the capital of Stanley was "severely cratered" by exploding bombs, as London said, it cannot likely be used soon by Argentine air transports to supply forces in the Falklands, or by fighter planes to attack British ships.

Britain therefore has taken an important step to help redress one of its

### Analysis

potential disadvantages—numerically smaller air units on the scene—though of course Argentina's air power remains intact on its more distant home bases.

It remains to be seen whether Argentina will send out its air squadrons, chiefly American-built A-4 Skyhawks, to oppose the Royal Navy around the Falklands. If it does, British officials say they are confident their missile-armed ships can handle the problem.

Yesterday's attack, by a Vulcan bomber flying the 7,000-mile round-trip from Ascension Island, and Sea Harriers, from aircraft carriers at the scene, was right on the schedule that London had announced.

Its main purpose, as a British source put it, was "a further tightening of the screw" by bringing the air and sea blockade of the islands into full effect.

When notice of the full blockade was issued Wednesday, as the British Defense Ministry pointed out yesterday, it was made clear "that after 48 hours' warning the airport [at Stanley] would be closed" and aircraft there would be subject to attack. The Vulcan bomber and Sea Harriers acted to "enforce the total exclusion and to deny the Argentines use of the airport."

American naval sources said action to prevent supply and tactical air operations was the first essential step

RAID . . . . . Pg. 2-F

NEW YORK TIMES 1 MAY 1982 Pg. 1

## Transcript of Remarks By Haig on Falklands

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 30 — Following is a transcript of remarks by Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. at the State Department this morning, as recorded by The New York Times:

The South Atlantic crisis is about to enter a new and dangerous phase in which large-scale military action is likely. I would like to bring you up to date on what we have done and why and what we must do now.

We have made a determined effort to restore peace through implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 502. That resolution calls for an end to hostilities, the withdrawal of Argentine forces from the islands and a diplomatic settlement of the fundamental dispute.

The United States made this extraordinary effort because the stakes in human lives and international order require it. From the outset, the United States has been guided by the basic principles of the rule of law and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The collapse of that principle could only bring chaos and suffering. We also made this effort because the crisis raised the vital issues of hemispheric solidarity at a time when the Communist adversaries seek positions of influence on the mainland of the Americas and latent territorial disputes in much of the hemisphere called for unity and the resolute defense of principle.

### Confidence of the Parties

We acted as well because the United States has the confidence of the parties. The United Kingdom is our closest ally, and Prime Minister Thatcher's Government looked to us to pursue a peaceful solution. We have also recently developed a better relationship with Argentina as part of our success in revitalizing the community of American states. President Galtieri also requested our involvement.

Under the direction of President Reagan, I participated in many days of intense discussion with the parties in search of a framework for implementing U.N. Security Council Reso-

lution 502. Our initial aim was to clarify the position of the parties and to offer suggestions on how those positions might be reconciled. We took no position on the merits of either the British or Argentine claims to the islands.

As the prospects for more intense hostilities arose, we put forth an American proposal. It represented our best estimate of what the two parties could reasonably be expected to accept and was based squarely on our own principles and concern for the rule of law. We regard this as a fair and a sound proposal.

### The U.S. Proposal

It involves a cessation of hostilities; withdrawal of both Argentine and British forces; termination of sanctions; establishment of a United States, United Kingdom, Argentine interim authority to maintain the agreement; continuation of the traditional local administration with Argentine participation; procedures for encouraging cooperation in the development of the islands, and a framework for negotiations on final settlement taking into account the interests of both sides and the wishes of the inhabitants.

We had reason to hope that the United Kingdom would consider a settlement along the lines of our proposal, but Argentina informed us yesterday that it could not accept it. Argentina's position remains that it must receive an assurance now of eventual sovereignty or an immediate de facto role in governing the islands which would lead to sovereignty. For its part, the British Government has continued to affirm the need to respect the views of the inhabitants in any settlement.

TRANSCRIPT . . . . Pg. 2-F

WEEKEND EDITION -- 2 MAY 1982

## RAID....CONTINUED

the British had to take regarding the Falklands themselves, as they tried to maintain steady pressure on the Buenos Aires government.

The next step is Britain's secret and can be a matter only of speculation.

Operating in very rough seas, the British fleet must enforce the blockade and try to wear down the Argentine garrison.

The fleet commander may be directed to put commando outfits ashore for harassing attacks. London has been mysterious about whether this may already have happened on West Falkland Island, where the Argentine garrison is much smaller than on East Falkland, where Stanley is located.

While Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. has expressed concern that "large-scale military action is likely" soon, British sources did not appear to regard a big invasion of the Falklands as an immediate likelihood.

Some of the troops that would be needed are reported to be several days away in transport ships.

Invasion timing may, in fact, have become less important with yesterday's bombing, if the bombing was as successful as London claimed.

A source quoted by the Associated Press and identified as being within the Royal Navy said, "We're in no particular hurry [to invade] and I think we can afford to play a waiting game. It will lower Argentine morale on the Falklands if we let them get cold, wet and miserable."

He thought an invasion, if it is coming, could be delayed for as much as a week.

Diplomatic efforts to resolve the crisis would continue during that period, others noted.

The next moves in the South Atlantic could be heavily influenced, too, by military decisions and actions Argentina may undertake.

Buenos Aires has not yet elected to have its Navy engage the British fleet. Argentine ships, not the equal of British ones in quality, are at sea but remote from the 200-mile Falklands blockade zone, according to sources here.

It cannot be told yet whether the Argentine navy will try to wait out the blockading British in the turbulent seas around the islands, or will choose to try to get through to the Falklands garrison. Nor can it be told whether a British stratagem would be to try to draw out the Argentine fleet with the aim of administering a morale-breaking defeat.

WASHINGTON POST 2 MAY 1982 Pg. 18

# Administration Says Air Attack On Island 'Complete Surprise'

By John M. Goshko  
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Reagan and other administration officials said yesterday that Britain's air attack on the Falkland Islands was "a complete surprise" to the United States, and they added their hope that the British-Argentine dispute can be resolved without widened warfare.

Reagan, talking with reporters as he began a trip to the opening of the World's Fair in Knoxville, said he doesn't believe that full-scale hostilities "necessarily have to follow." He added: "We still stand ready to help. We hope there can be a peaceful solution."

The president's comments came a day after he ended the U.S. even-handed approach to the dispute by accusing Argentina of "armed aggression," imposing military and economic sanctions against the military regime in Buenos Aires and promising to give "materiel support" to Britain.

At the Defense Department, officials said no formal requests for aid had been received from the British, but they added that a call for help appears inevitable because the British fleet in the South Atlantic is operating 8,000 miles away from its home bases and will require fuel and other logistical help.

There have been published reports that Britain can sustain its warships for 90 days with the fuel, food, spare parts and ammunition already with the fleet or en route to it.

However, Pentagon officials are known to think that this estimate is way too generous and that, if the conflict goes on much longer, the United

States will be asked to take on part of the resupply burden.

The State Department responded to questions about the air raid with a terse statement: "The British do not advise us of their military plans."

Department spokesmen also refused to comment on how the United States views the potential effects of the bombing on the Falklands crisis.

Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. is scheduled to discuss the situation today with British Foreign Secretary Francis Pym, who is en route to the United Nations.

In private, department officials said the United States, having suspended Haig's mediation efforts and declaring its support for Britain, was in what some described as "a holding pattern," waiting to see if Argentina might adopt a more flexible attitude that would permit the resumption of negotiations.

The general view in official U.S. circles is that there is nothing the United States can do as an "honest broker" for the moment. The U.S. "sit" was intended as a signal to Argentina that the United States believes it should reassess its position, but U.S. officials fear that is not likely to happen until there are more military encounters.

If that happens and Argentina perceives itself to be losing militarily, it might begin to look more actively for a compromise, the officials said. They added, though, that a few more days probably will be required until Washington has a clearer picture of where the dispute is moving and whether there might be new opportunities for diplomatic initiatives.

## TRANSCRIPT....CONTINUED

The United States has thus far refrained from adopting measures in response to the seizure of the islands that could have interfered with our ability to work with both sides in the search for peace. The British Government has shown complete understanding for this position.

## U.S. Steps Against Argentina

Now, however, in light of Argentina's failure to accept a compromise, we must take concrete steps to underscore that the United States cannot, and will not condone the use of unlawful force to resolve disputes. The President has therefore ordered the suspension of all military exports to Argentina, the withholding of certification of Argentine eligibility for military sales, the suspension of new Export-Import Bank credits and guar-

antees and the suspension of Commodity Credit Corporation guarantees.

The President has also directed that the United States will respond positively to requests for materiel support for British forces. There will, of course, be no direct U.S. military involvement.

American policy will continue to be guided by our concerns for the rule of law and our desire to facilitate an early and fair settlement. The United States remains ready to assist the parties in finding that settlement.

A strictly military outcome cannot endure over time. In the end, there will have to be a negotiated outcome acceptable to the interested parties. Otherwise, we will all face unending hostility and insecurity in the South Atlantic.